



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

indicate their wishes to the Secretary of the Institute, Prof. Mitchell Carroll, The Octagon, Washington, D. C. Members of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, not already members of the Institute, may subscribe to Art and Archaeology through the Secretary-Treasurer, by sending 80 cents for the four numbers to appear in 1914, and \$1.60 for the twelve numbers of 1915 (the regular rates are \$1.00 and \$2.00).

We commend the new journal to the careful consideration of the members and the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. The purpose of the new journal, as set forth in a prospectus,

is to give people, in an interesting and attractive way, the information they wish to have in the wide realm embraced by the name. This information is imparted by interesting reading matter prepared by men and women who are masters in their several fields, and by beautiful pictures produced by approved modern processes. Human interest, timeliness and literary merit are the tests applied in the selection of articles, and artistic quality and appropriateness are the standards in the selection of illustrations.

The contributed articles are of varied interest, embracing the fields of Oriental, Greek, Roman, Christian, Renaissance, and American Archaeology and Art. Full page illustrations are made an attractive feature. Notes from the various fields and brief paragraphs concerning archaeological discoveries, new books and other items of current interest are worthy of mention.

The General Editor of Art and Archaeology is Professor David M. Robinson, of The Johns Hopkins University. The two numbers thus far published have contained much interesting matter and numerous excellent illustrations.

C. K.

LIBERAL STUDIES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM¹

No sensible person will deny the justice of the popular demand upon Secondary Schools for broader educational opportunities for growing boys and girls; and every thoughtful person will welcome discussion which shall honestly, fairly and sincerely point the way to these opportunities. For America, adequate systems of education, particularly of public education, must be ready to meet the insistent demands constantly and rapidly increasing in number and in variety. To the foreign-born, to the delinquent and to the deficient, to that large army of boys and girls who, through misfortune or circumstance, must leave the school-room the moment the compulsory education law will permit, and to the claims of rural communities we must turn an open mind and a sympathetic ear. These problems are crowding upon us and have attracted public attention and have aroused public interest in the cause of education to a most remarkable degree. Because secondary education is in a state of development, public interest has centered

largely in *its* function and *its* obligation to the public it serves. The discussion has been fast and furious and some of it has been futile and foolish; but in general it has been marked by an earnestness of purpose and a sincerity of motive which must eventually bring us to safe, sane and sound conclusions.

Much of the discussion has unfortunately fixed our attention too exclusively upon schemes of education suggested by a deplorably material and commercial age. We seem to be using the terms 'practical' and 'useful' and the sign of the dollar interchangeably. We talk of 'democratic' education with a flourish that reminds one of a brass band and a Fourth of July orator. What is 'democratic education?' For some reason, which I do not clearly understand, the line seems to be drawn between the tested, tried and proved subjects of liberal education and the new and as yet untested and untried elements of what we are pleased to call 'progressive education'. We are apparently forgetting the vast armies of boys and girls ready, by desire, by ambition and by tradition, for that training of the mind and of the spirit which shall make of them thoughtful, enlightened and forceful citizens of a great republic. For the time being, we seem to have lost sight of the fact that "man does not live by bread alone" and we are unmindful of the history, past and present, which teaches us that scholarship and leadership go hand in hand.

It is time to stop and consider, time to emphasize the other side of the discussion; for this reason I count it an especial privilege to be permitted to voice my hearty good wishes to this new Association for the Promotion of Liberal Studies. I have a very wholehearted and earnest belief in the superior educational value of the so-called 'traditional' subjects. I am not lacking in respect for those not included within this group. I appreciate their importance, the growing demand for them and the growing need of them. The eye and the hand must be trained, but the eye and the hand will obey the trained mind, and as instruments of education the popular vocational subjects have not, as yet, proved their right to be called equivalents. It behooves us to be very careful how we substitute things for thoughts and persuade ourselves that we shall get the same results. Recently, it has seemed to me that there are most encouraging indications that this discussion of the new education on the one hand and of traditional education on the other is taking a more reasonable turn. For a long time the daily press and certain very popular magazines exploited the cause of vocational training to the exclusion of every other kind. Very readable and very interesting but not altogether dependable articles dealing with the advantage of the new education have been numerous and conspicuous and very alluring appeals have been made on the ground of democracy. The appeals have seemed to me undemocratic in that they have treated of vocational education only in its narrowest sense. Would it not be quite as undemocratic to

¹ This address was delivered at the organization meeting of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies, March 14, 1914.

provide vocational training for all boys and girls as it is to give all boys and girls traditional training? And it is to be remembered that traditional training is also vocational since it has led and always must lead to the great professions of law, medicine and teaching.

Many times in these articles the artist has been called in to point the argument by placing before us striking pictures of stoop-shouldered, big-spectacled boys and girls bending over Greek lexicons or Latin grammars, while on the next page rosy-cheeked, golden-haired damsels beat eggs and broad-shouldered young men plane boards with enthusiasm. We are invited to gaze first upon this picture and then upon that. The reading public could not be expected to know that such schools of traditional training as these articles picture do not exist to-day. They cannot be expected to understand that even traditional education can be administered by modern methods and that the good health and fine appearance of boys and girls are a matter of as much importance in academic as in vocational schools. But now, it is no unusual experience to pick up the daily papers and current magazines and to find, from the pen of unquestioned authority, articles calling us back from the extreme view which has been taken and impressing upon us the fact that, as surely as we must meet the demands for broader opportunities, just so surely must we remember the supreme importance of that training of the mind and that cultivation of the heart which can come only through careful, serious and thoughtful contemplation of the old rather than of the new, that definite mental discipline which is acquired through the study of languages—ancient as well as modern—, that development of reason which is the result of an intimate acquaintance with a rigid course in mathematics, and that intelligent and sympathetic view of our present civilization which can be derived only from a knowledge of the world's past history.

Further, special, technical and vocational schools are more and more insistently demanding thorough and careful preparation in liberal studies. The engineering faculty of a great University recently entered a successful protest when an important preparatory school proposed to eliminate Greek from its curriculum; and the dean of that engineering faculty told me a few weeks ago that there is no preparation for a student of engineering equal to the old-fashioned classical course. In a bulletin on vocational training recently issued by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, 206 institutions offering special and technical training to women are listed. Of these, 20 specify no entrance requirements; 25 ask a High School diploma or its equivalent; 77 base admission on the College Entrance requirement; 18 admit by special examination; 38 require a bachelor's degree or its equivalent as shown by examination; 22 require one year or more of College work; 3 require normal training and 3 graduate degrees.

These instances with others that we are meeting frequently would seem to indicate that to its other advantages a liberal education is adding a considerable commercial value. But, aside from the indications of the practical value of a liberal education, is it too much to hope that learning may be cherished for learning's sake in this great country of ours? that culture for culture's sake may not be despised? and is not discipline a worthy end in itself? Why is learning as represented by traditional training aristocratic? surely not because it is confined to the rich and to the great. No one familiar with large public Secondary Schools will find good reason to question the absolute democracy of the personnel of the College preparatory courses. No one acquainted with the results of this training and the achievements of its product can question its usefulness, its value and its inspiring influence in lives otherwise blank, bleak and drab.

Why must culture be mentioned with a sneer as though it were not a very real and a very important factor in the lives of individuals, of communities and of nations? Those of us who daily contemplate young America wending his happy way through pleasant educational pastures, browsing a little here and nibbling a bit there, and at the end proudly displaying a handsome sheepskin, will, I am sure, agree that disciplinary subjects shall forever be encouraged. And so, my plea is for the encouragement of liberal studies in High Schools in recognition of their proved value to generations of boys and girls, for a just acknowledgment of the plain duty of High Schools to prepare boys and girls for a larger life than mere wage-earning. Scholarship and culture must be preserved in any nation that is to be truly great.

The discussion is turning, the pendulum is coming to normal; we are reaching the very certain conviction that the past in education was not all bad, that the present is not all good and that real progress will be made only by taking the best from past and from present into the future as we go. There is plenty of room in the world for both forms of education and plenty of work for the adherents of both sides of the discussion. I cannot believe that what is being called 'progressive' or 'democratic' education will ever find itself firmly established until it lays its own foundation in the solid rock of discipline, of thoroughness and of concentration of thought and effort and gives over its apparent attempt to raise itself upon the ruins of traditional training. It has seemed to me an indication of weakness that much of the support of the 'new' education has taken the form of condemning the old. I realize that much of the discussion has had for its object the drawing of public attention to the new cause—a trick of advertising entirely unworthy of the magnitude and the importance of the problem. But the smoke of battle is lifting and soon we shall all see more clearly and in truer perspective.

In the meantime, I congratulate you on the organization about to be consummated; I am heartily in sym-

pathy with your object. I like the optimism of your name which calls for the promotion rather than the protection of liberal studies; and, more than all, I have an abiding faith in your broad vision, your deep sympathy and your comprehensive knowledge of educational problems.

GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL,
PHILADELPHIA.

KATHARINE M. PUNCHEON.

ONE WAY TO TEACH LATIN

The demand for more definite constructive criticism of the teaching of Latin which appeared in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7. 97-98, 145-146, seems to me a reasonable one. We can really be of little service to one another until we are willing to explain not what ought to be done but what we actually do in our class-rooms. Personally I have the grandest ideals of what Latin teaching should be and I never care to read another man's opinion of what we *should* do in the class-room for the simple reason that my own ideals keep me busy enough. In actual practice I find that they meet so many obstacles—set up doubtless by the demon of things as they are—that by the end of the school year they are mutilated beyond hope of recognition. When, however, a teacher is willing frankly to show how he has faced the difficulties that beset us all and what his experience has been, we are all anxious to learn and glad to set him down as a benefactor. Accordingly I wish to take my own medicine in the hope that some one who is hoarding secrets of value may be led to communicate his knowledge as freely as I proffer my trifles.

Judging from my own experience I have long been under the impression that our greatest fault as teachers is unconscious hypocrisy. We know our subject quite well, we teach it quite well, and then we naturally suppose that our pupils have learned it quite well. And here lies our error. We forget the old maxim that taught us never to under estimate the ignorance of our pupils, and we ascribe to them knowledge which they might have, which indeed they ought to have, but which they have not, and which, I regret to say, they don't care to have—if they can get along without it. In fact this fault is so widespread that I think that most of the present criticism of our schools, when justified, is really caused by this one deficiency.

In my own work I have found it facing me at every turn. Owing to the peculiar organization of our school my relations with my pupils are so personal and intimate that there is absolutely no line of any kind between them and me. This circumstance has given me opportunities to understand the attitude of the scholars which the average teacher can not possess; and I should have to be blind not to become conscious of the failing to which I have alluded. In my Vergil class, however, I have employed a method which has enabled me at least to estimate what my class really knows far more accurately than I could ordinarily.

The class is small, averaging about twenty pupils. These are usually delightful as individuals and as a class, but I am sorry to say they manifest no great enthusiasm for Latin. They look upon Vergil as the last Latin obstacle on the path to a diploma and after the first month of polite interest they are content to recite when called upon and for the rest to sleep—figuratively if not literally¹.

Some years ago I contrived to infuse some life into the class by insisting that the pupils do practically all the work done. So successful has the plan been that I have never seen occasion to modify it.

The method is very simple. I call upon a pupil to translate and after he has read the requisite number of lines I ask him to stop. Then the other students, without raising their hands or paying any attention to me, point out the mistakes and ask whatever questions they choose. If there is a difference of opinion about a construction they argue it out, without referring to me except as a last resort. As a rule a student is not supposed to make more than one criticism at a time. I have occasionally left the class-room, but this proceeding is, I believe, frowned upon as a kind of breach of contract. In addition to their regular work students receive credit for the criticisms they make and for all questions which they ask and can answer themselves. Those pupils who fail to do a reasonable amount of this class-work have their marks lowered. It has to be made absolutely clear that pupils who translate are to be marked only on the teacher's judgment of their recitations and that nothing is to be subtracted on account of questions asked or criticisms made upon their work by fellow-pupils. Unless the class is convinced of the teacher's sincerity in this particular little can be accomplished.

When I first introduced this system of reciting I was surprised to find a great deal of opposition—good-humored but real. I had thought that such a slight change would be received without comment, but I soon discovered my mistake. For weeks I was obliged to defend my course by arguing with various individuals out of class and I am not sure yet that they were ever convinced. As one boy put it the scheme was not fair. He had to study an hour or so on Vergil outside of class and now I insisted that he work just as hard during the period. Soon, however, the plan came to be looked upon as a more or less harmless vagary of a perhaps well-meaning but certainly erratic teacher. During that year I was repeatedly asked when they were going back to the old system.

¹ I regret that I am obliged to admit having such mediocre classes. It is especially humiliating when I realize, as I listen to some teachers talk, that in a Vergil class all that they have to do is to put the last polish upon a well-nigh finished product, which emerges from the process a cultured citizen. I have to feel satisfied if I have succeeded in coaxing a few of my class to think occasionally for themselves. Here let me also record my envy of Dr. Radin, whose experience with students has been so fortunate that he can even evolve an hypothetical boy who will, when the vocabulary in his text fails him, turn to Roget's Thesaurus (shall we say to the word *belief* with its two or three hundred expressions?) and then with the aid of a dictionary select the exact equivalent of his Latin word. I am chagrined to say that I am sometimes forced to urge my pupils to use their notes.